

REMARKS

Claims 1-32 remain in this application. Claims 6, 15, 20, 21 and 27 were amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments.

The Abstract was objected to for informalities. With the above amendments, Applicants respectfully submit the Abstract is in proper form and that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13, 16, 17, 20, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Bradshaw* (US Patent 6,674,731).

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bradshaw* (US Patent 6,674,731) in view of *Gernert* (US Patent 6,600,734).

Claims 6, 14 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bradshaw* (US Patent 6,674,731) in view of *Birdwell* (US Application 2001/0024435).

Claims 25, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bradshaw* (US Patent 6,674,731) in view of *Dillon* (US Patent 6,338,131).

Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Bradshaw* (US Patent 6,674,731) in view of *Dillon* (US Patent 6,338,131) and further in view of *Gernert* (US Patent 6,600,734). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, none of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose "a burst channel demodulator interface coupled to an antenna associated with the terminal and configured to permit exchange of the data frame between the terminal and the satellite, the data frame conforming with different return channel frame formats" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 9, 17 and 25. *Bradshaw* discloses an RF receiver, coupled to an antenna to permit exchange of data between a remote terminal and a satellite, under a DVB protocol format (col. 3, line 49, FIG. 10). *Bradshaw*, however, differs from the presently claimed invention, in that the teaching

of *Bradshaw* only discloses a single return channel format (col. 9, lines 36-46). In contrast, the presently amended claims provide for different return channel frame formats, and are supported in the specification, particularly in paragraphs [82-83] and [169]. These features are also not taught in any of the other cited references.

Furthermore, claim 1 recites a “burst channel demodulator interface” (similarly recited in claims 2, 10, 18 and 26), which is not taught by *Bradshaw*. With regard to *Gernert*, the reference teaches that access points to wireless LANs (col. 2, lines 37-48) are capable of supporting IEEE 802.X data ports for communicating docking stations or wells 96 through a wired LAN (col 10, lines 1-8, 47-48). While the IEEE 802.X standard is known in the art for communicating through wired LANs, there is no teaching in *Gernert* for bursting data frames through a terminal/hub/satellite/host configuration recited in the present claims.

Also, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine *Gernert* with *Bradshaw*. While *Bradshaw* discloses a system for communicating TCP/IP data over a satellite communication channel (col. 3, lines 32-55), *Gernert* discloses a system for interfacing a wireless LAN with a wired voice telecommunications system (col. 1, lines 21-26). In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. §103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious (MPEP 2141.02). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure (MPEP 2143).

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Craig Plastrik, at 301-601-7252, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: 9 November 2004

Craig Plastrik
Reg. No. 41,254

THE DIRECTV GROUP, INC.
(formerly Hughes Electronics Corporation)
Customer No. 20991